

Administrative - Internal Use Only

PERS 75-2188

DD(A) 75-4347

SEP 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT : Secretarial Survey

I. BACKGROUND:

A. At the CIA Management Committee meeting of 11 September 1974, it was the consensus of the Committee that:

"1. The Agency secretarial pattern system which establishes secretarial grades on the basis of the organizational level and grade of the supervisor's position be continued as a guide in determining pay levels for secretaries. . . ."

"2. An evaluation of secretarial positions be made in all cases to determine if there is a basis for a grade higher than the pattern, based on merit; and, if so, that such grade be approved. It should be recognized that whenever a position is upgraded because of higher level duties and the secretary is promoted, she would be subject to downgrading upon reassignment to a position not having the higher duties. . . . NOTE: As a means of facilitating the review of positions to be conducted by the Office of Personnel, each Career Service will conduct a review and initial screening of positions which may be candidates for upgrading. This review will initially be devoted to senior positions."

B. At a subsequent meeting of the Management Committee during the week of 16 June 1975, "it was concluded that perhaps 'senior secretaries' is a misnomer in terms of adequately defining the many tasks they are called upon to be proficient in, particularly abroad. A new job description or category covering these positions in the Operations Directorate is to be considered. The Director of Personnel will review in conjunction with the DDO Staff and advise."

II. SCOPE:

In response to the Management Committee directives, PMCD reviewed and evaluated those positions which were recommended for upgrading by the Career Services. The positions ranged in grade from GS-07 through GS-10 and totaled 62 in number, Agency-wide. Of these, seven positions were submitted for upgrading consideration by the Offices of the DCI group (two were upgraded with five reaffirmed at their current grade);

Administrative - Internal Use Only

Administrative - Internal Use Only

nine positions were submitted by the DDI (one was upgraded and eight were reaffirmed at their current grade level); one position was recommended for upgrading by the DESGT (this position was reaffirmed at the current grade level). The Operations Directorate submitted a total of forty-five secretarial positions for upgrading. Of these positions, audits confirmed that nine positions, based on their substantive content and the performance of their current incumbents, were somewhat stronger than the others. However, external comparisons do not justify promotions of these secretaries on an incumbency allocation basis. (A list of all positions recommended for upgrading is attached as Appendix "A".)

During the course of the survey, situations were encountered and information developed which expanded the scope of the survey from the review and evaluation of secretarial grades and titles to identification of problems cited by secretaries which are perhaps basically more important, including secretarial utilization, promotion policies, interest in other career fields, recognition, and employee career management and development. Conclusions drawn relating to position grades and titles, employee utilization, promotion policies, and recognition are applicable to secretaries, Agency-wide.

The mechanisms cited herein as currently available within the Agency to cross over into other career fields can be and are utilized by all talented clerical employees, not just secretaries.

III. FINDINGS:

A. Position Titles:

A secretary, by definition, is one who acts as a personal assistant to a supervisor, is flexible and adaptable, and capable of doing what must be done to promote the smooth flow of work into and out of an office. Based on current duties and responsibilities, the positions which were reviewed in this survey fulfill, to a greater or lesser degree, this definition, and are properly titled within the Secretarial Series. It is doubtful that a change in title would serve any useful purpose. In a recent Secretarial Survey at the Department of State, a recommendation to establish an "Executive Secretary" title was shelved because of the difficulty in assigning the title equitably. Additionally, several of the secretaries interviewed in the Department of State survey felt that a title change would be an empty gesture and "an insult to the secretary's intelligence."

B. Position Grades:

Of those positions included in the survey, most were found to be overgraded by one to two grades when evaluated according to Civil Service Commission Standards.

Administrative - Internal Use Only

With regard to the Agency secretarial pattern generally, external comparisons were made with other Federal agencies and with private industry. These comparisons indicate that Agency secretarial grades and salaries are essentially equal to those provided by other agencies and private industry. (Appendix "B") Thus, there appears little justification for upgrading the Agency pattern to provide GS-08, GS-09, and GS-10 grades for secretarial positions which relate to the GS-16 through GS-18 officer levels. Incidentally, such action would result in an additional cost [redacted] annually.

STAT

(Appendix "C") Moreover, as evidenced by two news articles (Appendix "C-1"), there are those who allege that 70% of the secretaries in the Foreign Service and a substantial number in the Navy Department are already overpaid, and suggest the possibility that a recent reclassification program in the Navy, if extended, could affect many of the 38,000-plus secretaries in the government.

With regard to occasional statements that "the Agency is losing its best secretaries because of advancement opportunities on the outside," a review of attrition figures for secretaries in grades GS-07, GS-08, and GS-09 during 1973 and 1974 revealed that of a total of 127 separations, only two were for reasons of advancement. (Appendix "D")

Though all of the secretaries interviewed expressed an interest in having their jobs upgraded, several other comments and complaints suggest deeper problems than position grades. These comments are noted in the following paragraph.

C. Secretarial Comments/Complaints:

1. Under-Utilization:

A primary complaint of every senior secretary interviewed was that of under-utilization, either in her present position or at some point in her career. Each believed that supervisors were not allowing senior secretaries to use initiative nor take on "personal assistant" responsibilities, both of which are requisite to performing as a true secretary. Many noted that their job could be better described as Clerk-Stenographer than Secretary because the supervisor made use of only the clerical skills of the incumbent.

2. Promotion Policies:

a. Rapid Promotions:

Promotion policies which allow a secretary to be promoted to grade GS-07 within as little as two years were roundly criticized by many of the senior secretaries. The view was expressed that there was no feeling of having earned the promotions because they came

Administrative - Internal Use Only

so easily. Those who spoke to this subject said that secretaries become accustomed to rapid promotions, only to be frustrated at the GS-07 level beyond which promotions are extremely limited in the secretarial field.

b. Officer vs. Secretarial Promotions:

In general, both officer and secretarial promotions from Grade GS-07 through GS-11 are made competitively, based on quotas established under the CSGA. However, only those secretaries who have headroom in their current assignment are considered for promotions while headroom in the position is not necessarily required for the promotion of officers. This is viewed as a "discriminatory practice" by secretaries. This matter is examined further in paragraph V, C.

c. Advancement Limitation:

Opportunities for secretarial promotions are extremely limited above grade GS-09. Agency-wide, these opportunities are limited [] GS-10 positions [] GS-11 positions, excluding [] located in the DCI's office. Some secretaries expressed the view that they should be provided the opportunity to be promoted at least as high as grade GS-13 as secretaries in positions other than that of secretary to the DCI.

D. Lack of Interest in Other Career Fields:

Although not completely satisfied with the secretarial field, many senior secretaries profess no interest in transferring to other career fields where promotional opportunities are greater. They maintain that they enjoy being secretaries, at least when they are allowed to take on responsibilities commensurate with their grades and experience.

A few of the secretaries objected to the inclusion of their occupation in the group of clerical positions, saying that their career is professional and requires experience, judgment, initiative, and the ability to solve problems. Some acknowledged that their dislike for the term "clerical" stemmed from the fact that their supervisors treated them as office furniture or as persons able only to fetch and carry.

However, one major advantage to the clerical classification as opposed to a professional classification is that the clerical employee falls within the non-exempt category for overtime purposes under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). Therefore, under penalty of law, secretaries must be paid for all overtime worked. This results in larger paychecks for most employees in the secretarial field. "Professional" employees are considered exempt under the Act and work extra hours without compensation.

Administrative - Internal Use Only

STAT
STAT

STAT

IV. OTHER CAREER FIELDS AVAILABLE TO SECRETARIES:

In the past two years there has been headway in developing a personnel management structure for the clerical group, particularly for those employees engaged in duties of a secretarial nature. Within the Directorates, 11 offices have secretarial evaluation panels; others are being developed; and the DDO has a Directorate-wide panel stemming from PASG recommendations. There are career counseling services in being for all employees. If a secretary or other clerical employee is interested in being considered for professional employment, mechanisms now exist within the Agency to assist in the accomplishment of that goal.

A. DDO-

Under this DDO instruction, a clerical employee who desires professional status (and is sponsored by a Division) is tested, interviewed and evaluated. If the DDO Junior Officer Panel believes that the individual has potential, he/she is accepted as a professional employee and assigned to a professional position, usually as an Intelligence Operations Research Analyst or as a Junior Reports Officer. These two career fields allow progression to the GS-15 level for talented employees. In FY 1975, the Operations Directorate moved 54 employees from secretarial positions into non-secretarial positions leading to professional status.

B. DDI - Advancement Opportunities Program:

This recently initiated program provides for on-the-job training for a person from the clerical ranks in a professional position for a period of one year. If the person works out well in the job, he/she will be permanently assigned as a professional; if not, he/she will be returned to the clerical ranks. Seven secretaries were converted to professionals in FY 1975.

C. DDA:

The DDA has recently assigned a full-time professional officer (DDA Clerical Coordinator) who is charged with developing approaches within the Directorate designed to enhance and upgrade the status of secretaries so as to provide them with career enhancing amenities comparable to those provided professionals.

The Office of Training is examining its supervisory, managerial and clerical courses to include material on improving the supervision and utilization of secretaries.

Administrative - Internal Use Only

DDA Career Sub-Groups have no formalized system per se for moving employees from the clerical to the professional ranks. However, personnel are evaluated for potential and counseled to pursue training toward a degree. An effort is also made to assign those who want to change career fields into appropriate positions which provide training for the next higher level position. In FY 1975, the Administration Directorate moved 16 clerical (Secretaries, Clerk-Stenos, Clerk Typists) employees into professional positions.

D. IDS&T:

In the Science and Technology Directorate, 26 employees changed from the clerical to professional category in FY 1975.

V. COURSES OF ACTION AVAILABLE:

There are at least four courses of action available:

A. Arbitrarily upgrade the senior secretarial pattern as follows:

<u>Supervisors Grade</u>	<u>Secretaries Grade</u>
GS-18	GS-10
GS-17	GS-09
GS-16	GS-08

This course of action cannot be supported on the basis of external comparisons nor by position responsibilities. It would be costly and would be susceptible to criticism in light of increased concern of possible overgrading of secretarial positions in other agencies.

B. Upgrade Certain Secretarial Positions on an Incumbency Allocation Basis:

Though there are nine positions in the Operations Directorate that, based on their substantive content and the performance of their current incumbents, are relatively stronger than the others, external comparisons do not support promotion action on an incumbency allocation basis. Such a limited number of upgradings would not have any substantial effect in improving career opportunities in any case.

C. Extend PRA Promotion Policy to Cover Secretaries:

Since a number of secretaries expressed the view that present PRA promotion practices are discriminatory, this appears to be an issue which should be addressed. While the concept of PRA promotions can be questioned generally, the fact remains that the present application of

Administrative - Internal Use Only

the concept permits the PRA promotion of officers but excludes secretaries. It must be noted, however, that officers are normally promoted within the CSGA, and thus assignments at the higher grades are available. On the other hand, the promotion of secretaries above the grades of their positions would result in escalation of secretarial grades beyond the available secretarial positions at the higher grades. Ramifications such as this should be thoroughly explored before the concept of PRA promotions is applied to the secretarial group, since current PRA regulations do not contemplate such promotions where higher grade assignments will not be available within a reasonable period. The attrition rate at the senior secretarial level is expectedly low, since secretaries tend to reach the top grades of their profession at a relatively young age -- 20 years or so before retirement. Senior officers look to retirement because of age and the PRA system is therefore workable.

D. Make No Change in the Secretarial Title or Grade Pattern but Seek to Improve Agency Practices Regarding the Utilization, Progression, Recognition, and Career Management and Development of Secretaries:

1. Secretarial Utilization and Advancement Opportunities:

Supervisors must be encouraged to permit secretaries to use their initiative, exercise judgment, and perform more responsible functions within the context of their current assignments. The effect such enhancement will have on secretarial grades, however, must be recognized as minimal. While a great many senior secretaries expressed little interest in career fields offering greater promotional opportunities, transfer to such other fields offers the only practical solution. Secretaries should be apprised of the limited opportunities that are now, and for the foreseeable future will be, available in the secretarial field. The existing programs that offer qualified secretaries opportunities to move into professional career fields should be expanded. Supervisors should be encouraged to recognize that it is in the Agency's interest to provide such opportunities, even though it means that excellent secretaries may be lost and replacements must be trained.

2. Expansion of Formalized Career Service Management of the Secretarial/Clerical Employee Group:

As expressed elsewhere in this paper, the Agency's Career Services have made headway over the past two years in instituting formalized consideration of certain aspects of career management for the secretarial/clerical employees within their Career Services. There is a clear and definite need for expanded programs to assist talented and ambitious secretaries to expand their potential fully, to increase career opportunities, enrich their job environment and to allow the

Agency to take full advantage of existing personnel resources. Secretaries comprise a significant and essential segment of our total work force and the Agency, through its Career Services and Sub-Services, must be actively concerned with their interests and morale to the same attentive degree directed to the needs of professional personnel. The secretarial "problem" is multi-faceted and will not be solved by title changes, position upgrading or token actions. The decision has been made that employee career management should be decentralized and administered on a Career Service basis. It is incumbent, therefore, on each Career Service to fully formalize procedures for the career management of secretaries. The Office of Personnel and OMS/PSS could be tasked to assist the Career Services in the development of procedures as appropriate to meet the particular needs of the secretarial group.

F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel

Atts.
As Stated

Distribution:

- Orig + 1 - Adse, w/att
- 1 - D/Pers, w/att
- 1 - DD/Pers-P&C, w/att
- 1 - OP/PMCD

AT
OP/P&C/
Revised (22 Sep 75)

A

STAT

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

B

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

COMPARISONS WITH OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES1. DIA

<u>Position</u>	<u>Supervisor's Grade</u>	<u>Secretary Grade</u>
Director, DIA	3 Star General	GS-09
Deputy Directors	2 Star Generals/GS-17	GS-08
Division Chiefs	Brig Gen/GS-16, GS-15, Military 06	GS-07

2. NSA

<u>Supervisors</u>	<u>Secretary</u>
Director/Deputy Director	GG-11
Assistant Director	GG-10
Group Chief Up To	GG-10
Office Chief Up To	GG-09
Division Chief Up To	GG-08
Branch Chief Up To	GG-07

(Internal Policy recognizes organizational levels which create ceilings for the secretarial positions. An employee of a lesser grade could be assigned to the position, but not one with a higher grade than the ceiling allows.)

3. Department of State

<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>Secretary</u>
Secretary of State	GS-13 or FSS-2
Under Secretary	GS-12 or FSS-3
Dep Under Secretary	GS-11 or FSS-4
Asst Secretary	GS-10 or FSS-4/5
Deputy Asst Secretary	GS-7/9 or FSS-7/9
Office Director	GS-6/8 or FSS-8/6
Division Chief	GS-6/7 or FSS-8/7
Branch Chief	GS-5/6 or FSS-9
Section Chief	GS-4/5 or FSS-10/9

(The Deputy Under Secretary level can be compared with the Agency DD level. With that as a starting point, the Assistant Secretary level equates to the deputy DD level, Deputy Assistant Secretary to Office level, Office Director to Group level, and Division Chief to Branch level. The grades of secretarial positions are directly comparable.)

3. Department of State (Con't)

Foreign Services

<u>Level of Supervisor</u>	<u>Class of Mission</u>			
	I	II	III	IV
Chief of Mission	S3(GS-12)	S4(GS-10/11)	S5(GS-09/10)	S6(GS-08)
Dep Chief of Mission	S4	S5	S6	S7
Section Chiefs	S5	S6	S7	-
Unit Chiefs	S6	S7	S8	-

(Foreign Service secretarial grades depend not only on the level of the supervisor, but also the class of the mission. Some would insist

STAT

COMPARISONS WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Though the attached figures are somewhat dated (1 August 1973), the relationships are still valid in a comparison of weighted averages of clerical salaries with GS- equivalents in the Washington, D.C. area. Private salary information was derived from figures published by the Executive Compensation Service, AMACOM, a division of the American Management Association. GS grades were assigned to Agency positions with descriptions similar to those in the AMACOM report. Agency secretarial salaries are equivalent to the private industry salaries in all cases, though not necessarily at the step one salary of the grade ranges.

COMPARISON OF WEIGHTED AVERAGES OF
CLERICAL SALARIES WITH GS-EQUIVALENTS IN WASHINGTON D.C. AREA
AS OF 1 AUGUST 1973

Position Title	Private Industry * Annual Salary	Approximate GS Equivalent	Agency GS Grade ** For Similar Positions	GS Salaries Effective August 1973		
				Step 1	Step 4	Step 10
Clerk-Jr	5,200	GS-01 Step 3	4	6,882	7,569	8,943
Cleric-Int	5,928	GS-02 Step 4 - GS-03	5	7,694	8,465	10,007
Clerk-Sr (Group Leader)	6,604	GS-03 Step 3/Step 4	6 or 7	(6) 8,572	9,430	11,146
Clerk Typist	8,008	GS-05 Step 2/Step 3	5	7,694	8,465	10,007
Computer Oper-Jr	7,800	GS-05 Step 1/Step 2	5	7,694	8,465	10,007
Computer Oper-Int	9,516	GS-07 Step 1/GS-06 Step 4	7 and 8	(7) 9,520	10,471	12,373
Computer Oper-Sr	9,932	GS-07 Step 2	9	11,614	12,775	15,097
File Clerk-Jr	5,200	GS-01 Step 3	4	6,882	7,569	8,943
File Clerk-Sr	5,408	GS-02 Step 1	5	7,694	8,465	10,007
Keypunch Oper-Jr	6,760	GS-03 Step 4	No Agency equivalent position			
Keypunch Oper-Int	7,436	GS-04 Step 3/Step 4	4 and 5	(4) 6,882	7,569	9,943
Keypunch Oper-Sr	7,488	GS-04 Step 3/Step 4	5	7,694	8,465	10,007
Keypunch-Group Leader	9,100	GS-06 Step 3	6	8,572	9,430	11,146
Mail Clerk	5,980	GS-02 Step 4	5 and 6	(5) 7,694	8,465	10,007
Receptionist	7,124	GS-04 Step 2	5	7,694	8,465	10,007
Secretary	8,476	GS-05 Step 4/GS-06 Step 1	5 or 6	(5) 7,694	8,465	10,007
Executive Secretary	8,840	GS-06 Step 2	7	9,520	10,471	12,373
Secretary to Staff VP	9,828	GS-07 Step 2	(7) 7 or 8	9,520	10,471	12,373
Secretary to Exec VP	11,648	GS-08 Step 4/GS-09 Step 1	8	(8) 10,528	11,581	13,687

COMPARISON OF WEIGHTED AVERAGES OF CLERICAL SALARIES WITH GS-EQUIVALENTS IN WASHINGTON D.C. AREA (Con't)

PAGE 2

Position Title	Private Industry * Annual Salary	Approximate GS Equivalent	Agency GS Grade ** For Similar Positions		GS Salaries Effective August 1973		
					Step 1	Step 4	Step 10
Secretary to Chief Exec Officer	13,208	GS-10 Step 2/GS-09 Step 5	9 and 10	(9)	11,614	12,775	15,097
Statistical Clerk-Sr	7,800	GS-04 Step 5/GS-05 Step 2	7		9,520	10,471	12,373
Statistical Typist	7,228	GS-04 Step 3	5 or 6	(5)	7,694	8,465	10,007
Stenographer-Jr	6,552	GS-03 Step 3	5		7,694	8,465	10,007
Stenographer-Sr	9,464	GS-06 Step 4	6 or 7	(6)	8,572	9,430	11,146
Typist-Jr	5,564	GS-02 Step 2	4 or 5	(4)	6,882	7,569	8,943
Typist-Sr	6,916	GS-04 Step 1	5 or 6	(5)	7,694	8,465	10,007
MT/ST Operator	6,656	GS-03 Step 4	5		7,694	8,465	10,007

* Private Salary information derived from figures published by Executive Compensation Service, Amacom, a Division of American Management Associations.

** GS Grades assigned to Agency positions with descriptions similar to those in the Amacom Report.

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

C

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

IMPACT OF EXTENDING THE SECRETARIAL PATTERN
AGENCY-WIDE*
FOR OFFICER LEVELS GS-16 THRU GS-18 AS FOLLOWS:

<u>Officer Level</u>	<u>Secretarial Position Grade</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
GS-16	GS-07	GS-08
GS-17	GS-08	GS-09
GS-18	GS-09	GS-10

I. NUMBER OF UPGRADINGS REQUIRED:

GS-07 to GS-08
 GS-08 to GS-09
 GS-09 to GS-10

STAT

II. ANNUAL ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL COST:

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Cost Per Upgrading</u>
GS-07 (Step 1)	\$10,520	
GS-08 (Step 1)	\$11,640	\$1,120
GS-09 (Step 1)	\$12,841	\$1,201
GS-10 (Step 1)	\$14,117	\$1,276

STAT

III. INCREASE IN AVERAGE POSITION GRADE:

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Net Increase</u>
10.5630	10.5877	.0247

*Source: 31 May 75 Agency Position Control Register

IMPACT OF EXTENDING THE SECRETARIAL PATTERN
WITHIN THE OPERATIONS DIRECTORATE*
FOR OFFICER LEVELS GS-16 THRU GS-18 AS FOLLOWS:

<u>Officer Level</u>	<u>Secretarial Position Grade</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
GS-16	GS-07	GS-08
GS-17	GS-08	GS-09
GS-18	GS-09	GS-10

I. NUMBER OF UPGRADINGS REQUIRED:

GS-07 to GS-08
GS-08 to GS-09
GS-09 to GS-10

STAT

II. ANNUAL ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL COST:

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Cost Per Upgrading</u>
GS-07 (Step 1)	\$10,520	
GS-08 (Step 1)	\$11,640	\$1,120
GS-09 (Step 1)	\$12,841	\$1,201
GS-10 (Step 1)	\$14,117	\$1,276

STAT

III. INCREASE IN AVERAGE POSITION GRADE:

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Net Increase</u>
10.5720	10.6037	.0317

*Source: 31 May 75 Position Control Register for the Operations Directorate
(Excluding Vietnam Station)

IMPACT OF EXTENDING THE SECRETARIAL PATTERN
WITHIN THE ADMINISTRATION DIRECTORATE *
FOR OFFICER LEVELS GS-16 THRU GS-18 AS FOLLOWS:

<u>Officer Level</u>	<u>Secretarial Position Grade</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
GS-16	GS-07	GS-08
GS-17	GS-08	GS-09
GS-18	GS-09	GS-10

I. NUMBER OF UPGRADINGS REQUIRED:

GS-07 to GS-08
GS-08 to GS-09
GS-09 to GS-10

--

II. ANNUAL ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL COST:

STAT

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Cost Per Upgrading</u>
GS-07 (Step 1)	\$10,520	
GS-08 (Step 1)	\$11,640	\$1,120
GS-09 (Step 1)	\$12,841	\$1,201
GS-10 (Step 1)	\$14,117	\$1,276

--

III. INCREASE IN AVERAGE POSITION GRADE:

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Net Increase</u>
10.0063	10.0259	.0195

*Source: 31 May 75 Position Control Register for the Administration Directorate

IMPACT OF EXTENDING THE SECRETARIAL PATTERN
WITHIN THE INTELLIGENCE DIRECTORATE*
FOR OFFICER LEVELS GS-16 THRU GS-18 AS FOLLOWS:

<u>Officer Level</u>	<u>Secretarial Position Grade</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
GS-16	GS-07	GS-08
GS-17	GS-08	GS-09
GS-18	GS-09	GS-10

I. NUMBER OF UPGRADINGS REQUIRED:

GS-07 to GS-08
GS-08 to GS-09
GS-09 to GS-10

--

STAT

II. ANNUAL ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL COST:

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Cost Per Upgrading</u>
GS-07 (Step 1)	\$10,520	
GS-08 (Step 1)	\$11,640	\$1,120
GS-09 (Step 1)	\$12,841	\$1,201
GS-10 (Step 1)	\$14,117	\$1,276

STAT

--

III. INCREASE IN AVERAGE POSITION GRADE:

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Net Increase</u>
10.8539	10.8807	.0268

*Source: 31 May 75 Position Control Register for the Intelligence Directorate

IMPACT OF EXTENDING THE SECRETARIAL PATTERN
WITHIN THE S & T DIRECTORATE*
FOR OFFICER LEVELS GS-16 THRU GS-18 AS FOLLOWS:

<u>Officer Level</u>	<u>Secretarial Position Grade</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
GS-16	GS-07	GS-08
GS-17	GS-08	GS-09
GS-18	GS-09	GS-10

I. NUMBER OF UPGRADINGS REQUIRED:

GS-07 to GS-08
GS-08 to GS-09
GS-09 to GS-10

II. ANNUAL ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL COST:

	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Cost Per Upgrading</u>
GS-07 (Step 1)	\$10,520	
GS-08 (Step 1)	\$11,640	\$1,120
GS-09 (Step 1)	\$12,841	\$1,201
GS-10 (Step 1)	\$14,117	\$1,276

III. INCREASE IN AVERAGE POSITION GRADE:

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Net Increase</u>
11.0393	11.0605	.0212

*Source: 31 May 75 Position Control Register for the S&T Directorate

C-1

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5
WASHINGTON
POST
11 July 1975

The Federal Diary Navy Cuts Secretarial Pay, Levels



By
Mike
Causey

Many of the 38,000-plus government secretaries and stenographers who work here could be in for demotions and pay cuts if an ongoing Navy reclassifications program is expanded to other agencies.

There are indications that other federal departments will follow the lead of Navy—the area's biggest employer—which recently desk-audited 171 secretarial-type jobs at one installation and ordered 125 of them downgraded.

Navy said that 124 of the women must be dropped one pay grade, and one worker will have to take a two-grade pay cut at the Naval Ships Surface Command in White Oak, Md.

The flap began in December when a Grade 7 (\$10,520-\$13,679) employee classified as an administrative assistant asked that her job be raised to Grade 8 status. Navy sent over a job classification specialist, who decided that the job was not worth Grade 8 pay status, or even the GS-7 level the woman held. Instead, he said it should be reclassified as a Grade 6, which pays from \$9,473 to \$12,317.

Navy then ordered desk audits of all the 171 related jobs at the facility and determined that most of them were overgraded. Just the other day it gave 60 day notices (by law 30-day notice of an "adverse action" is required) that the jobs were to be downgraded.

The employees, mostly in pay grades 6 through 9, have 15 days to appeal the action and produce evidence that their jobs are—as some are—properly classified at the current levels.

The Navy downgrades could very well be just the tip of the iceberg. There is a strong feeling among top federal officials here (at the \$36,000 pay level, incidentally) that secretarial and clerical jobs in this area have benefited by an abnormal grade inflation. They blame the tendency to hire secretaries, stenos and other clerical workers at higher grades on internal competition between federal agencies, not on pay pressure from the private sector, which has a relatively small chunk of the area's full-time workforce. More than 340,000 people here work for the government.

Navy secretaries, needless to say, are furious over the action, which they believe is the worst form of sex and class discrimination. "Some of the personnel people involved recently got their own jobs raised by a (pay) grade or two," one secretary said, "while they were deciding that we were overpaid."

Navy brass, worried about the impact on morale, say that even if all the downgradings at the Ships Command stick, it will still "compare favorably grade-wise" with other Navy and federal units in the Washington area. "But nothing can knock the pins out from under an operation faster than this sort of thing," one personnel official confided. "Who, in God's name, wants his secretary mad at him?"

Private employers here have complained, for years, that they can no longer compete with federal pay scales or fringe benefits, especially retirement plans and paid vacation.

One top Defense personnel official, who asked not to be identified, said he had the feeling that secretarial-level jobs in all federal agencies have been "overgraded here because of competition between agencies."

He said that Navy in some suburban locations, for example, had been raising the grade levels of secretaries to keep women from going over to

Health, Education and Welfare and other agencies. He also said that many downtown agencies had raised their grade levels to lure women who prefer to work in the suburbs rather than downtown, where parking is more expensive and restaurant meals more costly.

...and the Civil Service Commission—in charge of overall federal job standards—has taken "an interest" in the Navy downgrading situation and many members of the personnel community expect the desk audits will be extended to other agencies and other job classifications.

Most of the Navy employees who will be downgraded—if their appeals are rejected—will not immediately lose money, officials said. The majority of them will be placed in comparable pay steps (each pay grade has 10 longevity steps), but they would eventually lose out in pay raises.

Trades Helpers: Government agencies here are looking for helpers in painting, plumbing, electrical, woodworking and printing work. The jobs pay \$4.54 an hour. No experience is necessary, and some of the jobs provide training that could lead to better pay and craftsman status. Get details from the Civil Service Commission at 737-9616.

Secret Report Reveals Abuses in Federal Jobs

by Robert Walters

WASHINGTON, D.C.

While Henry A. Kissinger is busy trying to resolve the world's troubles, serious problems affecting his State Department employees in Washington go uncorrected.

A secret government study, prepared earlier this year by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, accused the State Department of "serious management neglect ... needlessly high personnel costs ... and significant violations of the basic Civil Service rules and regulations."

Rep. John E. Moss (D., Calif.), who uncovered the suppressed document, says it "shows that a series of demoralizing personnel abuses prevail in one of the most important agencies in government."

Adds Moss: "A pattern has emerged showing that few federal agencies have escaped this syndrome." That charge is supported by newly disclosed information that shows abuse in scores of federal departments, agencies and bureaus in Washington and across the country.

Keep a secret

But for more than a quarter century, the public has been denied access to official government reports that tell of incompetence, overstaffing, maladministration, violations of employee rights and illegal patronage operations.

For example, the report on the State Department offers this picture:

- Nine out of 10 promotions apparently are "in substantial violation" of the government's merit system requirements. Employees trying to move up run into arbitrary policies and murky standards on promotions.

- As many as 1300 Civil Service employees in the department receive a higher salary than they deserve. One survey showed that nearly 70 per cent of all foreign service secretaries are paid too much for the work they perform.



Rep. John Moss: He uncovered confidential report showing personnel abuses, wasted money at the State Department.

- At one message center there are three bosses to oversee six employees. In one branch of the department's Passport Office, 19 workers are watched by six supervisors.

- Despite the department's repeated public commitment to equal employment opportunity, only 6.2 per cent of all Foreign Service Officers are minority group members. Women fare somewhat better, with 25.4 per cent, but most of them are in low-level support positions.

- A policy of seldom looking outside the State Department for talented

people has kept many retiring officials on the payroll as "consultants" because of the department's apparent "inability to find qualified replacements."

The Civil Service Commission has conducted hundreds of other investigations similar to the State Department probe it completed in January.

PARADE
20 July
1978

Last year, for example, the commission uncovered a "special referral unit" at the Department of Housing and Urban Development which maintained secret files on 1300 men and women who either held or were applying for HUD jobs.

The unit checked on the political affiliations of applicants for and employees in ostensibly nonpolitical Civil Service jobs. Those designated as political loyalists were given preference. A similar illegal scheme was discovered at the General Services Administration.

Access forbidden

Despite these findings, the public has been told virtually nothing about the investigations, conducted by the Civil Service Commission's Bureau of Personnel Management Evaluation.

Workers at the investigated agencies, representatives of government employee unions, lawyers and a host of others have been routinely and firmly denied the reports although pressure to make them public has mounted recently.

Informal requests, written demands citing the requirements of the Freedom

of Information Act and even lawsuits have been spurned by the Civil Service Commission, whose chairman, Robert H. Hampton, argues that "making our reports public could frequently constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."

The secrecy soon may end, however, because of two important recent developments. The first is a lawsuit alleging that Bernard Rosen, executive director of the Civil Service Commission, has acted illegally in refusing to make the reports public.

Court action

The court initially backed keeping the papers secret but an appeals court sent the case back to the first court, which ruled late last year that all of the material in the reports must be made public, with the exception of references to individual government employees and the Civil Service Commission's recommendations for improvements in the way other government agencies handle their employees. That decision is still being appealed, and the government has not released the documents.

The second development involves Moss, one of the most influential members of the House. Throughout Richard M. Nixon's tenure as President, Moss charges, "the Civil Service Commission remained inactive rather than choosing to vigorously challenge White House-orchestrated patronage abuses designed to make our career Civil Service politically responsive to the President's wishes." Now, Moss has mounted a campaign to make public the reports of the alleged corruption, although the government is dragging its feet.

But the time is rapidly approaching when the material will be released to the public—and then the taxpayers will discover that some of their worst fears about inefficiency, incompetence and corruption within the federal bureaucracy are true.



Civil Service chief Robert Hampton: He has fought to keep quiet government studies of corruption.

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

D

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

STAT

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2006/02/07 : CIA-RDP92-00420R000400010013-5